



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/656,320	09/06/2000	Douglas G. Delany		9073

25253 7590 06/18/2003

IBM CORPORATION  
IP LAW DEPT, ED02-905  
15450 SW KOLL PARKWAY  
BEAVERTON, OR 97006-6063

EXAMINER

SHIH, SALLY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3624

DATE MAILED: 06/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/656,320

Applicant(s)

DELANY ET AL.

Examiner

Sally Shih

Art Unit

3624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 April 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This communication is response to Applicant's amendment filed on April 29, 2003. The rejections are as stated below:

#### ***Status of Claims***

2. Of the original claims 1-17, claims 1, 3-6, 12-15 have been amended. Therefore, claims 1-17 are under prosecution in this application.

#### ***Summary of this Office Action***

3. Applicant's arguments filed on April 29, 2003 have been fully considered, and discussed in the next section below or within the following rejection are not deemed to be persuasive. Therefore, claims 1-17 are rejected as being unpatentable over the art cited below, and Applicant's request for allowance is respectfully denied.

#### ***Response to Applicant's Amendment***

4. The Examiner acknowledges Applicant's amended claims. Please see below for rejection with respect to these claims.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 3624

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Amended claims 1, 3-6, 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang et al. (United States Patent Number 6,119,160) in view of Kilkki et al. (United States Patent Number 6,230,144 B1).

Zhang et al. teach an accounting system. However, Zhang et al. failed to explicitly teach the use of weighted component, score or load. Here, Kilkki et al. teaches the use of weighted loads in determining the distribution of payments (column 4, lines 49-67 and column 5, lines 1-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention was made to modify Zhang et al.'s teaching to include a weighted feature for certain tasks or services offered. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because certain tasks or services offered required more capital based on the difficulty level. The weighted feature would enable the service provider to reflect the cost of the services more accurately and bill the services accordingly.

### ***Response to Applicant's Argument***

7. The Examiner acknowledges Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17. The Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, and discussed in the next section below are not deemed to be persuasive.

Art Unit: 3624

8. Claims 1, 3-6, 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang et al. (United States Patent Number 6,119,160) in view of Kilkki et al. (United States Patent Number 6,230,144 B1) as discussed above incorporated herein.
9. Claims 2, 7-11 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zhang et al. (United States Patent Number 6,119,160) as discussed in the second paragraph of page 3 of paper 3. Please note that the applicant did not make any specific arguments regarding these claims.
10. The applicant argued that "Zhang et al. failed to teach the assignment of a weight" to a web screen. The accounting is based on the function and the quantity of uses of the function. As discussed above and incorporated herein, Kilkki et al. teach the use of weighted loads in connection with the distribution of payment.

### *Conclusion*

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 3624


will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sally Shih whose telephone number is 703-305-8550. The examiner can normally be reached on Flexible Schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on 703-308-1065. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7687 for regular communications and 703-305-7658 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

sys  
June 13, 2003



**VINCENT MILLIN**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3800**